

REMARKS

Specification

Paragraphs 16 and 19 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found in the claims of the application as originally filed.

Claims

In the Office Action, claim 1-9 were rejected. In particular, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,211,848 to Plesniak. Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,665,318 to Arnon in view of U.S. Patent 6,710,770 to Tomasi, and in further view of Plesniak. Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Arnon in view of Plesniak.

In response, claims 5-9 have been cancelled, so the rejections of those claims are now moot. Claim 13-21 have been added. For the reasons set forth below, the pending claims are patentable in view of the cited references.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the imager is for projecting a reference beam and an object beam that interfere at the sensing surface of the reception device. Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify that the computer is (1) in communication with the reception device, and (2) is for determining the difference pattern between the original holographic image projected by the imager and the interference sensed by the reception device. The difference pattern can then be used to change the image projected by the imager.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: (1) there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings; (2) there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. In formulating a rejection under § 103(a) based upon a combination of prior art elements, the Office must identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the prior art elements in the manner claimed. See Memo by Margaret A. Focarino, Deputy Commissioner for Patent Operations, May 3, 2007.

Here, among other things, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1. In Arnon, optical, acoustic, position or movement sensors sense a user's interaction with the projected image. There is no teaching or suggestion of a reception (or sensing) device that has a sensing surface where a reference beam and an object beam for the projected holographic image interfere, so that the difference pattern between the projected image and the sensed image can be detected.

Tomasi also does not teach or suggest a reception device that has a sensing surface where a reference beam and an object beam for the projected holographic image interfere, so that the difference pattern between the projected image and the sensed image can be detected. In fact, Tomasi does not even involve the use of holographic images.

Plesniak involves holographic images, but in Plesniak the user's interaction with the holographic image is detected using a force-feedback (or haptic) device, which

reports the 3D position of a hand-held stylus. Again, like Arnon and Tomasi, there is no teaching or suggestion in Plesniak of reception device that has a sensing surface where a reference beam and an object beam for the projected holographic image interfere, so that the difference pattern between the projected image and the sensed image can be detected.

Therefore, the cited prior art references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims (see MPEP § 2143.03) are not obvious in view of the cited references.

The Office should note that new claims 13-15 have been added and that these claim depend from amended claim 1.

New claim 16 is an independent method claim. New claims 17-21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 16. For reasons analogous to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, claim 16 and its dependent claims are not obvious in view of the cited references.

Support for the claim amendments herein may be found throughout the application as originally filed.

Applicant is enclosing a power of attorney appointing the undersigned. Also enclosed is a petition for a one-month extension.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims presented in the present application, as either amended or initially presented in this Amendment, are in condition for allowance. Applicant's present Amendment should not in any way be taken as

acquiescence to any of the specific assertions, statements, etc., presented in the Office Action not explicitly addressed herein. Applicant reserves the right to specifically address all such assertions and statements in subsequent responses.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to properly respond to the Office Action and believe that the claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any remaining concerns, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below so that such concerns may be expeditiously addressed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 5, 2007



Mark G. Knedeisen
Reg. No. 42,747

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART PRESTON GATES ELLIS, LLP

Henry W. Oliver Building

535 Smithfield Street

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Ph. (412) 355-6342

Fax (412) 355-6501